

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-26 are pending in this Application.

Claims 1, 12, 19, and 26 are currently amended. Applicants submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-26 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Non-patent literature entitled “Implementing Oracle Workflow” by Mathieson et al. (hereinafter “Mathieson”), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0187127 to Gondi et al. (hereinafter “Gondi”).

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-26 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Mathieson in view of Gondi. The Office Action alleges that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Mathieson with the teachings of Gondi.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the evidence presented in the Office Action. In order to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness, three requirements must be satisfied: all limitations of a pending claim must be expressly or impliedly disclosed by prior art references; there must be a suggestion or motivation in the art for the ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the limitations; and there must be a reasonable expectation of success in making such a combination. (M.P.E.P. § 2143).

Applicants respectfully submit that Mathieson and Gondi, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-26.

For example, amended claim 1 recites the feature of “intercepting transaction data from the database transaction to create an electronic record prior to committing the associated database transaction to the database.” The Office Action merely alleges that it would have been obvious in view of Matheison and Gondi to check all requirements before committing the transaction to the database. However, Matheison and Gondi, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose intercepting transaction data from the database transaction to create an electronic record as recited in amended claim 1 prior to committing the associated database transaction to the database.

FIG. 1 of Matheison shows creating a document by having the user enter data into a GUI. At best, the document may be created when the user presses “Save.” However, Matheison fails to disclose intercepting transaction data from a database transaction to create an electronic record as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, Matheison and Gondi, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose the feature recited in amended claim 1 of “executing a rule associated with the electronic record to determine whether an electronic signature is required to connote review of the electronic record in order to commit the database transaction to the database.” Matheison does not disclose that a rule is executed to determine whether an electronic signature is required to connote review of the electronic record in order to commit the database transaction to the database as recited in amended claim 1. Furthermore, Gondi fails to cure the deficiencies of Matheison, and does not teach or suggest that any of the operations of FIG. 1 performed before committing a transaction include executing a rule associated with the electronic record to determine whether an electronic signature is required to connote review of the electronic record in order to commit the database transaction to the database as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Matheison and Gondi, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every claim limitation recited in amended claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable of the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 12, 19, and 26 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and

others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-11, 13-18, and 20-25 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 12, and 19 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the allowable subject matter. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
SFP:lls  
61246118 v1